

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the comments in the Office Action which has been carefully considered. It is respectfully submitted that all issues raised are traversed, being hereinafter addressed with reference to the relevant headings appearing in the Detailed Action section of the Office Action.

The Applicant has amended the claim set. The Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claim set are fully supported by the originally filed specification.

#### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 29 and 31 were objected to because of informalities. The repeated use of the word "the" has been deleted from these claims. The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the claim objections.

#### ***Claim Rejection – 35 USC § 102***

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 9 to 10, 14, 21 to 22, 26, 33, 35 and 37 as being anticipated by Jain et al (US Patent No. 5,729,471).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's reasoning. In particular, the Examiner refers to columns 27 line 15 to column 29 line 18 where the Examiner argues that Jain et al teaches that a three dimensional database, containing information from multiple images, is a manipulated image as required by claim 1. The Applicant notes that a three dimensional database is not a manipulated image as required by claim 1. Furthermore the Applicant notes throughout the description of Jain et al there is no disclosure of the three dimensional database in the form of an image being displayed using a display device. This contrasts to claim 1 which requires a display device adapted to receive the manipulated image from the image manipulator and to display the manipulated image.

It is clear throughout Jain et al that although a three dimensional database is generated, the purpose and use of the three dimensional database is to enable a selection of one of a plurality of available images from the three dimensional database to be displayed to the user.

Therefore, there is no teaching or suggestion as taught by Jain et al of integers (c) to (e) of claim 1. Similar arguments apply to the remaining independent claims.

#### ***Claim Rejection – 35 USC § 103***

The Examiner has rejected claims 3 to 4, 11 to 13 and 23 to 25, as being unpatentable over Jain et al. Furthermore, the Examiner has rejected claims 5 to 6, 15 to 16, 27 to 28, 34, 36 and 38 as being unpatentable over Jain et al. In further view of Suzuki (US Patent No. 5,847,836). Additionally, the Examiner has rejected claims 7 to 8, 17 to 20 and 29 to 32 as being unpatentable over Jain et al in further view of Kairouz (US Patent No. 5,812,071).

The Applicant respectfully submits that as the Examiner has relied upon Jain et al for disclosing integers (c) to (e) of claim 1, Jain et al in view of the above-mentioned citations also fails to disclose these claim limitations. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that the third basic criteria to establish a prime facie case of obviousness has not been made out for the above-mentioned claim limitations. Similar arguments apply to the remaining independent claims.

Based on these reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicant requests a Notice of Allowance of all the claims presently under examination.

Very respectfully,

Applicants:



---

Kia Silverbrook



---

Paul Lapstun

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762